Hi Jake,

I hope your new job is great!

I found some references online about how to make money, and advice from electricians on some of the opportunities and disadvantages. Perhaps they will help you plan your business. Some of the specializations make more money than others.

The thing is that I read that only 10% of people that start the process reach journeyman electrician, but 72% graduate UO.

You found a great opportunity in the North Bend area. Other cities could contain even better opportunities.

The thing is, what if you were had a look at the best of what you could find in Portland? Portland will have summer internships with practical experience. That applies to money making as well; business students starting companies during summer could give you fresh ground to find new opportunities. Give applying to college a try.

Ginny Prickett says the NBHS office has application and SAT fee waivers, so you can get the college option for free.

You might be able to get a baseball scholarship.
https://www.ncsasports.org/athletic-scholarships/baseball/oregon

There is tons of stuff online on how to make money, but a site called quora.com has questions and answers from some people that have actually succeded. You could browse around https://www.quora.com/How-can-I-become-a-multi-millionaire

An electrician describes what specialties earn more and also complains on Quora, https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-disadvantages-of-being-an-electrician

If you are up for it, lets meet again once more.
Also you can always call, text or email me treonsverdery@gmail.com (541) 252-0805

Go nuplazid!

Hi Doctor Webster,

I am diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia. The symptoms improved, and the side effects reduced when I self medicate with an additional 70 mg/day of pimavanserin (Nuplazid) I got from the internet.

Would you be willing to prescribe Nuplazid (pimavanserin) to complement the Latuda?

Nuplazid (pimavanserin) is FDA approved for treatment of psychosis in Parkinson's. As an antipsychotic It works well.

On 80 mg of Latuda and 70 mg of pimavanserin, compared with 160 mg of Latuda I am more alert, and feel less stupid. I no longer feel cold all the time and walk slowly. I feel much less fatigued. My mind is more alert and I think more quickly. Pimavanserin does not affect dopamine receptors, which might have to do with the reduced side effects.

Since being on pimavanserin I have done things that seem to suggest greater wellness, I volunteer more at the community and recently improved my personal appearance. I even hosted a visitor at my apartment.

I have been on pimavanserin for about three months with only positive things to say.

It seems to be essential to be on

Latuda along with the pimavanserin. When I tried pimavanserin alone for about 2 weeks The voices and hallucinations were still well treated but I felt nervous and something not quite paranoid, and not like suspicious, but something. Combining the pimavanserin with Latuda got rid of the “pre-paranoia” like feelings.

Right now I take about 70 mg of pimavanserin so the 68 mg from the standard pill dose is about the same.

Would it be possible for you to prescribe Nuplazid, continuing the three month improvement that has already occurred?

Thank you very much for considering this request.

should I create a collapse of the wave function thing or actual new structure to bring something more beneficial than MWI unity?

(That is should I read up more on non-unitry MWI and even seek to create it with new technologies)
notably this creates universes without a backup…
microuniques… A modification or replacement for unity MWI “its all happened” You could also optimize sentiently, amind or computer, reviewing back-to-the-start comparison views of optimality; (sort of like a two pass compiler working on the non-unitary MWI to optimize well being and benevolence) precluding

non optimal MWI universes. Also wikipedia says retrocausality of delayed quantum choice eraser is compatible with MWI. Addressable modifiable past, then put in some of the new artificial collapsible wavefunction technologies to build optimal reality.

Here it sounds like I am thinking, “what about those non-MWI explanations for wave function/schroedinger equation things? Should Iread up on those and think of new technologies for them that optimize well being, similar to Dave Pearce’ Hedonistic imperative as a path to optimize utility”

I read that Collapse of wave function is controversial or sort of previously problematical based on the way the math of the schrodinger equation is

continuous and does not have a noncontinuous component, so adding a noncontinuous component to the schrodinger equation after a successful questioning of the schrodinger equation (various described approaches and/or technologies at my notes) or replacement of the schrodinger equation could suggest new technological ways to create a completely new kind of collapsible wavefunction, me:“electrons are 3d, therefore equation factors of multiplication and division force a geometry not previously accounted for with the division ___ symbol or things^2 at physics equations”

A new physics technology/quick workaround; Collapse of the wavefunction could perhaps suggest or create or something that causes the cat to leap out of the box even though you were looking at the detector, **creating a completely**

different observable than the initial purpose of the experiment. I ought to do better than an “improbability generator” but new style of wave function collapse, possibly from something not predicted by the experiment as an outcome goes with new observable. Novel to me is that at a photon measurement there could be an unexpected, nonpredicted, yet physics based occurence like the detector breaking, a casimir particle setting off the detector, or the observing scientist falling in love and eloping rather than showing up that afternoon to complete the measurement. A functioning set theory math model of a “wavefunction collapse” would have to have a section or definitional space for the nonpredictable/

Make it so a person can have

some MWI universes and some collapse of wave function local events as they prefer

Augmenting MWI is Slightly reminiscent of a random looking non repeating region in a stable treelike cellular automata. The trigger pixels (uniqueness generating extra wave function collapses) could be generated from **modified planck length** technology (like if you think of a photon at a plack length “voxel”, and then quantum entagle it with 1000 other photons, then modify/observe just 1/1000th of the main photon’s quantum entanglement (view 1 out of the 1000 contingent photons) does this then cause a change at the photon smaller than a planck length or create smaller “voxels” from a technological activity. Also, and, or **observer observing an observer**

feedback. (figure out kind of like Wigner's friend); Could you have a light emitting light detector structure like holes and phonons in silicon, that emits while it absorbs facing another similar item. CCD camera with little double slits all over the ic wafer, this might sort of retroreflect "wigner's friend" - infinity mirror at a decoherence experiment.

Nifty: A surface, with writing on it, possibly AFM like, where the atoms actually change because you look at (observe) it, producing a dynamic document. With the AFM atoms at a Conway game of life then the automata rules generates fresh text. The Observer effect writes the book.

Would new planck lengths, like artificially produced tinier voxel-sizes and spaces affect density of

probability?

Aside: One of the previously described ways to modify the planck length is to quantum entangle 1000 photons to a prime photon, then have the prime photon traverse a planck length; meanwhile while traversing simultaneously, observe one or a few hundred, possibly at a spatial (plane or noneuclidean space defining) geometry, of the entangled photons. This way just 1/1000th of the prime photon’s nature is changed.
I think there might have been some other thing I recorded or made notes on as well.

Are time crystals (wikipedia) with dynamic ground states a novel area of MWI, unity version, because they contain a dynamic base state? sort of

reminds me of something 2 dimensional in a one dimensional system or math description; time crystals rather than being observed as one thing or another are observed as a multistate thing.

Wigner’s friend is something like talking about the laboratory with the human in a schroedinger’s box; the lab surrounds the other system, causing more objects to be involved, thus causing the indeterminacy to scope outward. This reminds me of optical and radioactive nested MWI universes. what does superposition do at nested universes?

“Let Wigner now ask his friend what he had obtained as a measurement result: Whichever answer the friend gives (0 or 1), in each case, Wigner would then assign the state "system is in state 0/ friend has measured 0" or "system is in state 1/ friend has measured 1" to the laboratory. Therefore, it is only at the time when he learns about his friend's result that
the superposition state of the laboratory collapses.”

If I read it right, it looks like there is a time topology novelty here, different than delayed quantum choice eraser but also time bending, “However, unless Wigner is considered in a "priviliged position as ultimate observer"[1], the friend's point of view must be regarded as equally valid, and this is where an apparent paradox comes into play: From the point of view of the friend, the measurement result was determined long before Wigner had asked about it, and the state of the physical system has already collapsed. When now exactly did the collapse occur? Was it when the friend had finished his measurement, or when the information of its result entered Wigner's consciousness? so, is it stretched time, overlapped time, or nested time? Do wikipedia Time crystals have novel technological effects at a wigner’s friend event?

Or is it just wikipedia’s thing where one article says the machine observation is sufficient to collapse the wave function, or with MWI, generate both versions of a 2 outcome experiment, so wigner’s friend is much less meaningful than the optical

detector’s existence.

Also, wikipedia says “Instead, *ψ [the wave function]* is an *abstract mathematical function* that contains all the *statistical* information that an observer can obtain from measurements of a given system [it is different than saying *ψ* is an entire atom]” are there things that precede (are littler than) an electron and a photon, such that observing that new thing creates or resolves or decoheres or causes completely novel unexpected electron or photon behavior? Could these littler things be a String theory test?

Is there some Shannon Information theory about noise that applies to *ψ [the wave function]* as it says, “contains all the *statistical* information” Is that information limited as to its transmissivity (from shannon, not just from uncertainty)?

If Wigner’s friend, the human observer matters, then create new ways of

observing to produce new possible occurences. At a wavefunction collapse theory experiment the consciousness notices the computer readout, and resolves the system. But a preliterate child looking at the screen might not collapse a wave function because they cannot interpret what the screen says.

So being able (technologically or from a newly educated mindset) to make completely new kinds of observations gives people the effective literacy to make completely new things that would have previously been quantum nondeterminacies. This reminds me of the physicists that say we are observing the universe into existence.

New observer machines: so a new machine that watches planck lengths change (entangled photons),

observing new lengths into being, would be the new observing machine that would quantum resolve and possibly ontologically make possible the change in new plancks length sizes.
That is the change in plancks length would be durable (technologizable) rather than undetermined.

Another technology:
How about a fancy electromagnetic machine that subtracts the full scope of the schoedinger equation's prediction of the hydrogen emission line prediction, and possibly the actual s-orbital, from an actual measured as yet-there-is-no-math(or equation)-to-predict-its-spectral lines lithium or higher atom.

After removing the S orbital

math/equation explainables, the stuff that remains to be observed into a state is the **newly quantum resolved actual stuff that causes the unpredicted spectral lines**, possibly isolating them, and making the undiscovered new physics math actual in some way, **even before a human figures them out**. This could be a little like priming the preliterate child, Like if you have a sqiggle attached to a sphere, subtract the squiggle, then the sphere exists in that it is a resolved quantum object.

If human observers matter then you could map out brain areas to find out which are necessary for wavefunction collapse; retina, text processing neurons; presence-of-being neurostructures; what I have heard called executive function and also the sentience not being too distracted to

notice something, of these mind processes and/or neural structures at an observer, which groupings are essential? Or Transcranial magnetic stimulation on a human observer. What is the neural duration of an observation? like 100 milliseconds or something lengthy like that? **Note: wikipedia says the machine doing the observation, rather than the human, is sufficient to collapse a wavefunction. Then some other part of wikipedia says something different.**

comical: an observation resolves a quantum state, so will willful ignorance recause superposition? Some person on quora says that when a thing ceases to be remembered it goes back to superposition, but that is just one idea. Maxwell Buchanan (halfbakery) says that when two MWI

universes are identical they collapse together into one. So, if you do a new quantum experiment 100 times, then set up the equipment and purposefully ignore it 300 times does that do anything? I am clueless but am wondering if you can get a retrocausality on the 100 actual observations. A mathematical set theory description of this could be nifty (and potentially expandable into new technologies).

stackexchange: What is an example of an orthogonal system performing the "measurement" operation? I know that a person *is* such an entity, but an electron is *not*, because if it was, it would collapse the wavefunction of its atom, which is not what we observe. – sqykly Mar 10 '17 at 21:04 Maybe something has to be made of certain quarks to be an observer? I think a two atom system can do the photoelectric effect, so a photon can be observed. What is it about a nucleus that facilitates observation? Can you

make an observer out of a hydrogen atom (proton) Are Neutrons, like the kind in a magnetic jar, also capable of observing? It could be there is a specific quark pattern that permits observation-from-a-machine. Could there be a quark technology that is shown to work, notably because it can observe/collapse a wave function/just measure a phenomena (as wikipedia says the machine is sufficient alone to make an observation)

sort of puzzling:
Quantum linked photon emitter sandwiched beteen two double slits
Я|| ——<entangled emitter>——||R.
R=detectors. The quantum entangled photons travel the two arms separately, then a double slit for each arm; does whichever one gets their first determine what the particle or wave output of the other?

One double slit is observed, does that affect the quantum state at the other double slit because of entanglement? particularly if there is a different observer at each slit you could preferentially observe one to be particle the other to be wave, but the photons are linked. Is it whichever one is an atom’s length nearest to the photon emiiter? Does some new thing happen?

Wikipedia says “The measurement process randomly picks out **exactly one** of the many possibilities allowed for by the state's wave function in a manner consistent with the well-defined probabilities that are assigned to each possible state.” seems improvable. Why (math identity: natural numbers)one? why not some other number, in some other system like .999… with an infinitesimal, or a (**duration** of observation times what is observed) multipart complex number? Hey, how about matrices?

most of the tic tac toe board goes unobserved, yet a couple values do get filled in with an observation

““The measurement process randomly picks out **exactly one** of the many possibilities allowed for by the state's wave function in a manner consistent with the well-defined probabilities that are assigned to each possible state.” So at Wigner’s friend, or the eloping scientist who omits the observation, is there a wider out-scope to the wave function? If there is a set theory version of this, that has a definitional place for the nonpredicted, Does the amount of spatial or volumetric or lightcone overlap of a 6 foot tall scientist leaving the building to elope have an effect on they physics and the math?

Wikipedia about one non MWI theory“Objective collapse theories differ from the Copenhagen interpretation in regarding both the wavefunction and the process of collapse as ontologically objective. In objective theories, collapse occurs randomly ("spontaneous localization”) or **when some physical threshold**

is reached, with observers having no special role. ,”
This sounds like Spontaneous collapse or decoherence at *random* causes actual things to be, as if predetected, to appear. This reminds me of the casimir effect. Casimir things come into being, and sometimes there is an observer, sometimes not, yet I perceive the casimir effect is thought to work even if you remove an observing apparatus. “when some physical threshold is reached” suggests that when there’s a **clump** (and also/or a casimir plate) its more likely to ontologically “be” so as a fun casimir thing could you make a weak casimir apparatus that causes vacuum generation of things at less than “clump” size, that are of “almost there” size (from that Objective Collapse theory’s idea that enough of something observes itself) This suggests a new area of Technology:

making things that are almost there, which could then **also** be observed into being with a completely different machine using a non-clump approach? Sort of a new kind of matter. These preclump sized things could Possibly be a test of Objective collapse or a source of new technologies.

If you quantum observe a big thing (I read about macroscopic quantum objects) and observe half of it with an either/or thing like particle or wave, on each side of the macroscopic object what does it do? Like two leaves on one plant, the plant is a macroscopic object, and you look at one leaf wave style and one leaf particle style, what happens?

Ethics at MWI "In these [time symmetric] theories, a single measurement cannot fully determine the state of a system (making them a type of hidden-variables theory), but given two measurements performed at different times, it is possible to

calculate the exact state of the system at all intermediate times.”
(since it is wikipedia they might know what they are talking about, but what about the smoothed version of a curve with calculus like a derivative? a smooth curve derivative seems pretty far from knowing an exact state) from

The start/end time symmetric thing wikipedia mentions Suggests that with MWI you can make two observations and know the middle. **Thus if you value a particular form of universe this provides a way to improve your belief that your activities at a MWI path is authentically beneficial. You could purposefully make start/end-> know middle observations to make the middle of the MWI universe beneficial and benevolent.**

Time symmetric interpretation goes with MWI and supports retrocausality (the JY (someone, JY, said they were from the future and told me things, their aim was to modify my life-behaviors, thus affecting the future) experience) As a time-symmetric creating a preferred middle at the MWI technology, Could an improved delayed quantum choice eraser, or variation on it, measure twice to get a time snapshot of what's between?

Wikipedia "suggesting that quantum gravity makes for fundamental limitations on the accuracy of clocks, which imply a type of decoherence. [fromMinority_interpretations_of_quantum_mechanics]"
Noting gravity might be one, are there new things besides observers, spontaneous clumps, and what is sort of like a grain size of gravity that could resolve either/or observations (decoherence)? Making those things could test physics, test the MWI,

possibly. Notably: Like is there something that the MWI precludes the existence of finding or making? Is there a way to rig something that lives in purposely overlapping MWI universes, perhaps a optical/radioactive nested structure, to have the rigged thing be an observer?
Maybe entropy could be observed to be different, or an unexpected value, between the two MWI universes So like “if MWI is true then at connected universes things are cooler/move more gradually”
Lets say **wearing white** attracts beneficial energy.

Ok, thinking of things that a functioning MWI would exclude, how about a big thing, this is like macroscopic quantum item, where the number of possible observations (like

an amount larger than the number of photons in the universe) is large enough to produce spatial contradiction of decoherence? Can people make a thing, that cannot be observed, because the MWI is actual, yet if people could make it it would refute the MWI? Such a physical object could refute or verify the MWI. Or regardless of what they saw, would people think they got the math wrong, or were still working on it, like explaining protein folding “has gotta be possible” Higher quality math (I’m reminded of set theory) could make it more of a verify/refute/verify experiment.

Is contradiction ontologically (isness) possible at decoherence? How and where? Does 2018 AD science and logic even permit contradiction? I do not know the math but because of

things like the incompleteness theorem can the math, that describes the physics, and assists with prediction, ever be functional enough to prove/refute/verify the MWI?